

December 13, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S18517

in triggering the Israeli-Arab war, certainly with no intention of benefiting us, and they are now involved in replacing the equipment the Arabs lost in that fracas. The Russians, by their own admission, continue to pour huge amounts of materiel and money into Cuba, as well as technical personnel . . . and provide funds, training and personnel for Communist bands throughout Latin America and Africa.

The Chinese Communists showed their gratitude for several years of trade with Great Britain by wrecking the British Embassy in Peking, beating up all the embassy personnel they could lay their hands on and ordering all their representatives in London to attack the English bobbies with axes and baseball-bats.

Furthermore, as the F.B.I. has reported, Communist espionage in the U.S. has *intensified* in recent years, not lessened, and has spread into so many forms that, for all practical purposes, every Russian citizen in America can be considered a potential spy.

And to top it all off, the Communists *talk* as nastily as they act; the U.S. is still the brunt of practically every outrageous insult the Russians and their satellites can think of . . . and there's been a noticeable upsurge in these tirades in just the past few months.

Would anybody *really* insist, therefore, that trade has made the Communists any more cooperative, any less hostile toward us? I would hope not, but still, the pro-trade people have the *other* arguments to fall back on.

The second argument is that trade will somehow wean Russia's satellites away from Russia and toward us, and make them a little more democratic in the process. Experience, however, proves that *this* hasn't happened, either. Every Russian satellite is furnishing aid to North Vietnam and bragging about its solidarity with Russia in nourishing the fight against the United States. In addition, there are proven instances of material we've shipped to satellites which they immediately forwarded to Mother Russia, though it theoretically was destined for them . . . and, worse yet, of material that's been transferred from *our* ships to, for example, Polish ships, and sent straight to North Vietnam.

With the possible exception of Rumania's refusal to condemn Israel in the recent war, I cannot recall a single instance in which Russia's satellites have not actively sided with Russia, and against us, on any important issue, despite all our efforts to convince those satellites that we love them.

In fact, according to the *Wall Street Journal*, our aid to satellites actually strengthens their allegiance to Communism and their resistance to change. The *Journal* points out, for example, that Rumania waited, in 1964, until being assured of a U.S. trade deal, then issued an edict forbidding even discussions of reform . . . and that Yugoslavia's alleged relaxation of totalitarian methods occurred only *after* we threatened to cut off trade with Tito two years ago.

At this rate, if we have to rely on trade to break up the Russian bloc, we'll run out of goods first!

The administration also argues that trade with the Communists is beneficial to us because it improves our total balance-of-payments picture. Well, in 1966, our East-West trade, according to the Department of Commerce, netted us a paltry 20-million dollars, against a loss, in the *total* balance of payments that year, of more than one-and-a-quarter billion dollars . . . which comparison ought to take care of *that* argument without further comment.

Actually, it's not the dollar volume of such trade that's important, but the products and services and, *most* significant, the political elements, *involved* in the trade. As Nikita Khrushchev said, "We value trade least for economic reasons and most for political reasons." And yet, just to show you how intensely the administration clings to this dis-

credited argument, Averell Harriman—a leading administration spokesman—said a year ago that people who oppose the balance-of-payments proposition are, in his words, "bigoted and pig-headed"—that's right, "bigoted and pig-headed" if you disagree, according to Averell Harriman.

The administration's fourth argument is—and there's no nicer word for it—pure economic harlotry. That's the argument that says we should supply the Reds because if we don't, the Reds will go elsewhere . . . which is the equivalent of saying—if you'll remember the recent articles in *Life* on the activities of the Mafia—that you might just as well play the slots because somebody else will if you don't. Furthermore, if the Communists could, in fact, get what they want elsewhere, they wouldn't be yennin so frantically to deal with us. The fact of the matter is that they *can't* get the quality, speed of delivery, service and replacement parts from anybody else; we make the best and sometimes the *only* kind of materials they need the most, and if they didn't get them from us, they couldn't get them *any* place. They would, in other words, have to make them themselves, if they could or wanted to.

Now, the administration's final argument is that our bolstering the Communists domestic economy will divert them from their emphasis on the military, which is, on its face, completely illogical. The opposite, in fact, is true: bolstering their domestic economy actually has helped them *strengthen* their military production . . . for the simple reason that every ruble they save on non-military needs—factories and chemicals and wheat and so forth—is another ruble they can spend on military needs.

Our Joint Economic Committee has reported, for instance, that Russia's industrial defense establishment has grown at a rate twice as fast as its domestic economy. A Russian economist has admitted that 30-to-40 million people are employed in that industrial defense establishment—30-to-40 per cent of all the workers in Russia—and that only 15 million or so work in other, non-agricultural jobs. It's no wonder the Reds pine so longingly for our products and our technical expertise, no wonder they're still using factories we helped them build before World War Two, and no wonder that they still produce less than one-and-a-half million automobiles for a total population of over 230 million people.

Furthermore, as the C.I.A. has reported, there is absolutely no evidence that the Communists plan any change in their present policy of emphasizing military-and-political efforts to the continuing detriment of their domestic economy.

Why the United States should pull Russia's domestic chestnuts out of the fire and thereby strengthen their defense industry—especially when the Communists obviously don't care that much about the domestic scene themselves—is incomprehensible to me. But what makes it even more incomprehensible is that many of the items we've licensed for export to Russia could be used for *defense* purposes as well as non-defense. Let's just review a few examples:

... nearly half-a-million dollars worth of diethylene glycol, which is used for, among other things, explosives and liquid rocket propellants;

... more than 6-million dollars worth of chemical wood pulp, which sounds innocent enough except that it's used to make solid rocket fuels;

... computers and computer parts, which the Russians admit they can't duplicate;

... precision machine tools, in which the Reds also confess they're inept . . . jet aircraft engines . . . rifle-cleaning compounds . . . diamond drill bits—which nobody else can supply—to help produce more oil . . . chemicals of all kinds . . . and countless varieties of scientific instruments, including ones

to measure radiation, aircraft flight performance and the quality of sophisticated optics.

The lists of such harmless little, non-strategic items run for pages and pages in government documents. The Department of Commerce was even ready to ship the Communists an instrument to improve the accuracy of Soviet missiles until South Dakota Senator Karl Mundt found out about it, last winter, and forced them to cancel the license.

Furthermore, the Department of Commerce—under constant harassment from the White House to free more items for export and to speed up the granting of applications for product shipment—removed some 400 items from the previously restricted list of trade goods, last Fall . . . and did so without even checking with the major intelligence organizations to determine if any of those items had strategic value. The Department said it had checked with what it called the "intelligence community", but when California Congressman Glen Lipscomb asked the intelligence agencies of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Defense Department about it, not one of them said they'd been asked for technical advice.

And that's not the only subterfuge going on. Another government report on items for export to the Communist bloc deliberately omitted a full list of types of machine tools because, said the committee which issued the report, "publication might upset normal commercial relationships". Result: nobody knew *what* was on the list until Congress got extra curious.

This haphazard, sometimes downright secretive, approval of commerce-for-communists takes on special meaning in view of the fact that the very communists we're helping so much by our trade are helping *other* communists to kill Americans. Commenting on this paradox, South Dakota Senator Karl Mundt stated last summer, "Americans are getting sick to their stomachs with an administration policy which is increasing American casualties through the supplies we send to the Communist states, which in turn are used to shoot and kill American boys . . . in Vietnam."

This continuing policy of shipping materiel and technical expertise to Communist nations has not only provoked a rash of proposed legislation in Washington, but has caused a large number of Red-trade advocates to have second thoughts about the benefits, wisdom and morality of such trade.

Russia and her satellites *are*—without the slightest reticence about it—supplying North Vietnam with hundreds of millions of dollars worth of materiel to support their war effort against us, including, of course, missiles, aircraft and weapons. Russia's aid to the North Vietnamese increased 50 per cent in 1966 over 1965, rose again in 1967 and, according to the Russians, will rise sharply this year. An estimated 80 per cent of all North Vietnam's imported war materiel comes from Russia and her satellites.

There's no question—even in the minds of administration spokesmen—that our present trade with Russia and her satellites makes it easier for them to help the North Vietnamese, though the pro-trade people do argue that the difference isn't significant.

There's more to this argument, of course, than the mere *practical* consideration of whether our trading with Eastern Europe helps North Vietnam prolong its war against us. There also is the *moral* question. As Senator Mundt puts it, "Never before in our history have we found it conscionable to trade with the enemy in time of war." New York Congressman Paul Fino states, "There is no moral justification for giving aid to those nations who are supplying our enemies in Vietnam." And California Congressman Glen Lipscomb says, "I am utterly unable to understand how it makes any sense to help